IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 4828 of 2004

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

RAJESHBHAI BHIKHABHAI CHAWDHRI

Versus

STATE OF GUAJRAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 4828 of 2004

MR MM TIRMIZI for Petitioner No. 1

MR AY KOGJE, AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

RULE SERVED for Respondent No. 1

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

Date of decision: 19/08/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

By filing this petition, the petitioner-detenu has challenged his detention order dated 12-02-2004. By

the said order, the petitioner is detained as a "bootlegger" under PASA. Along with the order of detention, petitioner is also served with the grounds of detention. In the grounds of detention, there is a reference about one criminal case pending against the petitioner. The said case is registered as Gunah Register No.5006/2004 under the Bombay Prohibition Act. In the grounds of detention, the detaining authority has also relied upon the statement of two secret witnesses. After considering aforesaid cases and statements of two witnesses, the detaining authority has passed the order of detention, which is challenged by the petitioner on various grounds.

2) Mr.Tirmizi, learned advocate for the petitioner submitted that there is only solitary case registered against the petitioner and considering the same, it cannot be said that the petitioner is a habitual offender. It is further submitted that considering the said case, it cannot be said that the petitioner has violated public order and at the most it can be said that law and order is violated by the petitioner. To substantiate his say, Mr.Tirmizi has relied upon the judgement of this Court in Sandip Omprakash Gupta Vs. State of Gujarat and others, reported in 2004 (1) GLR 864, wherein this Court has observed that a solitary offence under the Bombay Prohibition Act was registered against the detenu and the authority relied on two other unregistered offences based on statements of certain witnesses and, therefore, a learned Single Judge of this Court held, on facts, that the detenu could have been dealt with under the ordinary criminal law. The order of detention passed therein, treating the petitioner as a bootlegger, is set aside. Since I am bound by the view taken by the learned Single Judge, in view of the aforesaid ground about solitary incident of a registered case under the Bombay Prohibition Act, which can be taken care under the criminal law, this petition is required to be allowed.

3) At this stage, learned advocate for the petitioner made a voluntary statement that the petitioner will not enter Pandesara area of Surat city upto 31st October, 2004. This statement is recorded and it is for the police authority to monitor the compliance of this statement.

4) In view of what is stated above, this petition is allowed. The order of detention dated 12-02-2004 is quashed and set aside. The detenu, Rajeshbhai Bhikharibhai Chaudhary is ordered to be set at liberty

forthwith, if he is not required in connection with any other case. Rule is made absolute.

(P.B.Majmudar,J.)

/malek